



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/687,662	10/12/2000	Donald F. Gordon	SEDN/247CIP4	7766
56015	7590	12/11/2007		
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/ SEDNA PATENT SERVICES, LLC 595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE SUITE 100 SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702			EXAMINER BROWN, RUEBEN M	
			ART UNIT 2623	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/11/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/687,662

Applicant(s)

GORDON ET AL.

Examiner

Reuben M. Brown

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/25/2007 have been fully considered but are moot in light of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 6-13 & 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman, (U.S. Pat # 5,844,620), in view of Ellis, (U.S. Pat # 7,065,709).

Considering claim 1, the amended claimed method for providing an interactive program guide to a terminal comprising:

‘broadcasting less than the total number of available interactive IPG pages, each IPG page being transmitted as an encoded video stream having respective packet identifier (PID)’, reads on including program listings associated with at least one time slot to the terminal’, reads on the disclosure in Coleman that IPG pages may be transmitted to viewers as demand data, such that each IPG page(s) has its own PID for its packet stream, see col. 4, lines 40-50; col. 18, lines 10-40).

Regarding the claimed, ‘receiving a request message from the terminal for at least one IPG page, which includes program listings associated with at least one different time slot from the broadcasted IPG pages’, Coleman teaches a user interaction with an IPG that transmits a page to the user. However, Coleman does not explicitly teach that a request is received ‘from the terminal’, as recited. Nevertheless Ellis, which is in the same field of endeavor teaches that IPG pages may be transmitted to a subscriber upon request from the subscriber, col. 6, lines 4-67; col. 11, lines 10-21 in the event that a requested page is not already loaded at the receiver.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Coleman with the teachings of Ellis, for the desirable advantage of more enhanced program guide services, see col. 1, lines 35-45; col. 5, lines 1-28.

‘encoding the requested IPG page and assigning the encoded IPG page a particular PID’, reads on the disclosure in Coleman that the EPG may be transmitted in MPEG format and is associated with a PID, (col. 18, lines 10-45). As for the additional feature of, ‘encoding only a

Art Unit: 2623

guide portion of the requested IPG page using a temporal slice persistence encoding scheme, the requested IPG page including a guide portion and a background portion', Coleman teaches separating the transmission of IPG pages according to title & description, and the schedule information, but does not explicitly discuss the breakdown as 'guide portion' and 'background portion'. Nevertheless Ellis, which is in the same filed of endeavor teaches that "program guide data", which corresponds with the claimed 'guide portion', may be stored at the server and transmitted to the user, upon request see col. 6, lines 4-10.

'demand-casting the encoded guide portion a limited number of times in response to receiving the request', reads on the disclosure of Ellis, col. 1145, lines 12-16240-45

Considering claim 2, see Ellis, col. 11, lines 1-25.

Considering claim 6, the claimed feature reads on sending an encoded IPG page each time a subscriber makes such a requests, and is met by the combination of Coleman & Ellis.

Considering claims 7-8, 11-12 & 16-18, see Coleman (col. 4, lines 41-55; col. 7, lines 40-65; col. 11; col. 18, lines 25-48) & Ellis (col. 5, lines 1-31; col. 7, lines 1-31).

Considering claims 9-10, in-band and out-of-band transmission, see Ellis, col. 5, lines 31-55.

Art Unit: 2623

Considering claims 13 & 19, the claimed elements of a method for regenerating an IPG correspond with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 1, and is likewise analyzed.

Regarding claim 19, the claimed 'video encoder, transport multiplexor and modulator', reads on the transmission equipment in Coleman, and the program guide server 25, Fig. 2a, of Ellis.

Considering claim 20, the claimed session manager operative to receive a request message for the requested IPG page and direct the transport multiplexor to multiplex the requested guide stream into the transport stream, reads on the operation of the server 25 in Ellis, col. 6, lines 1-67.

4. Claims 3-5, 14-15 & 21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman & Ellis in view of Rocher, (U.S. Pat # 3,754,211).

Considering claim 3-5 & 14-15 & 21, Coleman does not teach transmitting an ACK signal when a page is received. However, Rocher teaches transmitting an ACK signal, for the receiver to acknowledge receipt of a data transmission. After the transmitter receives the ACK signal, the next data block is transmitted, col. 4, lines 35-45. If the ACK signal is not received within a certain time window, then the transmitter assumed there has been an error, and resends the data, col. 12, lines 2-10. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 2623

time the invention was made, to modify Coleman with known technology of halting transmission of data once an ACK signal has been received from a receiver and resending the data at least once, if the ACK signal is not received, for the desirable advantage of insuring reception of a transmitted block of data, as taught by Rocher.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Reuben M. Brown


REUBEN M. BROWN
PATENT EXAMINER